DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 153 SO 009 067

AUTHOR Moore, Kathryn McDaniel
TITLE The War with the Tutors: Student-Faculty Conflict at Harvard and Yale, 1745-1771.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 19-23, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Activism; *Conflict; Educational Attitudes; *Educational History; Higher Education; *Social Background; Student Attitudes; *Student Teacher Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; *Tutorial Programs; Tutors
IDENTIFIERS Harvard College; Yale College

ABSTRACT

This study hypothesizes that social demographic distinctions figured importantly in the interactions of students and tutors. Answers are sought to these three questions: (1) Who were the college tutors? (2) Who were the students most often in conflict with tutors? (3) Based on questions one and two, are there any significant differences in the characteristics of both groups that tend to confirm or deny Henry Adams' conclusion that social distinctions were the root cause of student discontent? The study is based on an analysis of the published biographical data of the graduates of Harvard and Yale colleges, faculty records, student diaries, and other materials available for the years 1745-1771. The analysis on the pattern and system of the educational enterprise at the two schools during the years in question indicates that family background counted for much more than other "credentials"; each college held and attempted to impart a distinct sense of mission to all members of its community; and the colleges were perceived as necessary by some and useful by others, although they had not yet assumed their role as significantly important institutions for status or career attainment. These findings lead to the conclusion that the widespread confrontations at both institutions were essentially disputes over "manner" and that the confrontations were strongly linked to basic differences of social status between students and their tutors. Tables are included. (Author/DB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

APR 16 1976

ED123153

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: SO HE
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE WAR WITH THE TUTORS: STUDENT-FACULTY CONFLICT AT HARVARD AND YALE, 1745-1771

Kathryn McDaniel Moore
Assistant Professor
Department of Education
Cornell University

A paper presented at the American Education Research Association in San Francisco, April, 1976

SO 009 067

In an essay for the North American Review in 1872, Henry Adams became one of the earliest American historians to suggest that information about students would be a useful tool for understanding colleges and subsequently American society.[1] A major focus of the essay was Adams' contention that "the relations between instructors and scholars were far from satisfactory,"[2] and that "the true grievance lay in the position of semi-hostility to the students taken by the college officers... The manner, not the act, of discipline was the cause of the evil."[3]

Adams was referring to Harvard College in 1786-87 as recorded in the diary of his famous relative, John Quincy Adams, then a junior. Adams' remarks stand out because he is among the few to suggest that the antagonism between students and faculty might be attributable to others beside the students. Beyond that Adams' essay suggests that historians, who are usually college teachers themselves, may have viewed student-faculty conflicts with an eye more sympathetic to the "miserable life" of the college tutors than to that of the students. More importantly there is the serious possibility that historians have misperceived the reasons for student indiscipline--that it lay less in the temper of the times or the intemperance of youth than in some circumstance closer to the heart of the student-teacher relationship. As Adams explains it:

> "Gentle as the rein was, and mild as were the punishments, hostility between students and instructors was a traditional custom of the college, and one which created most annoyance to both... the teachers as well as the taught. The system was wrong. While perhaps more liberal in its forms than any that succeeded it, the assumption of social superiority galled everyone subjected to it."[4]

This focus on conflict is downplayed in most historical depictions of the relationship between tutors and students in early American higher education. In fact, most descriptions have tended to emphasize elements of consensus and

community. Historians such as Morison[5] and Smith[6] have suggested that the relationship was basically close and cordial, characterized by shared values and fostered by the small and homogeneous nature of the institutions. While not discounting the basic validity of this description current emphasis has swung closer to Adams' position, to what one scholar has characterized as the "rising curve of collective student disorder."[7] And yet, for the most part, these more recent analyses have focused on the students to the neglect of the tutors and the student-tutor relationship itself.

The present paper takes up Adams' suggestion that a basic cause of student discontent and indiscipline during the eighteenth century lay in the system of social superiority upheld by the colleges and enforced by the tutors. But rather than examining the college laws and customs which undergirded such a system, I have approached the problem with the hypothesis that social demographic distinctions have figured importantly in the interactions of students and tutors. Thus, I have sought to answer three questions: 1) Who were the college tutors?; 2) Who were the students most often in conflict with tutors?; and, 3) Based on 1 and 2, are there any significant differences in the characteristics of both groups that tend to confirm or deny Adams' conclusion that social distinctions were the root cause of student discontent?

The study is based on an analysis of the published biographical data of the graduates of Harvard and Yale colleges, faculty records, student diaries and other materials available for the years 1745-1771. This period was chosen for a number of reasons. First, it was a time of considerable growth. Enrollments at both institutions reached levels they were not to attain again until the end of the century. Moreover, in each college these years encompass a single presidency, the Clap years at Yale and the Holyoke years at Harvard. Thus, serious fluctuations in presidential leadership through changeover is not an issue. It

should also be noted that the rising tide of revolutionary fervor, while present and undoubtedly influential, is taken as a constant for both colleges and does not enter directly into the considerations of this paper.

The analysis of demographic characteristics is not a new technique in historical studies, although it has only recently been used in major ways to analyze higher education.[8] Even without Adams' provocative assessment the question of social class and status differentials among college graduates is an important one. This study uses two principal variables as indices of socio-economic status, father's occupation and graduate's occupation. These data, whenever known, have been duly recorded in graduates' biographies for they have been generally acknowledged as probably the two best indicators of SES. They are vital to this study because, while comprised of relatively few categories during this time, occupations are assumed to indicate (within limits) general income level, educational attainment, social position and sometimes political and religious preferences. In particular, one's father's occupation had a lot to do with whether one attended college and perhaps for what reasons.

Other demographic variables that figure in this study are birth order, place of residence, age at admission to college, and religious preference. Birth order is of interest because of the custom of primogeniture. I was interested to see if there were any differences in the use made by families of college for the eldest as opposed to younger sons. Place of residence was taken as an indicator of the provinciality of the college and a possible basis of discrimination against students. Age at admission is interesting in itself and also as a determinant of age gaps between tutors and students. Finally, religious preference is useful for analyzing the extent to which differential treatment was accorded members of minority sects.

Having given these general parameters of the study let me turn to the first of the three subquestions: Who were the college tutors? In the literature the typical picture of the tutorship is that of an "ill-compensated, low-status" temporary position made up of "youngsters for whom teaching was only a bypath to more desired careers..."[9] In Shipton's words, it was a "miserable life."[10] However, subsequent studies have indicated that that is not the whole picture. In his essay, "The Teacher in Puritan Culture," Smith demonstrates that as the Harvard tutorship developed over time terms of service lengthened and a more favorable career climate emerged. By 1758 terms of nine years or more were common and even lifetime careers like Henry Flynt's were a possibility.[11]

My own analysis of the tutorship at Harvard extends the Smith investigation another fifteen years. Nevertheless, many of Smith's conclusions hold true. As Table 1 indicates, the average term (excluding Flynt's 55 years) continued to be nine years. The average age of the tutors at the beginning of their service was 27 years. Typically, they had entered Harvard at the usual age of 16; graduated at 20 or 21, and then occupied themselves for some six or seven years before assuming a tutorship. Common activities for this interim period included keeping school (60%), other college offices, especially butler or librarian (50%) and continued education on the Hopkins or other fellowship (25%).

Of the 15 Harvard tutors who served during the period 1745-1771, 40 percent were eldest sons. As Table 2 indicates, their father's occupations were equally divided between the ministry (29 percent), farming (29 percent) and trade or manufacture (29 percent). The only other professional father was a Harvard professor. With regard to the tutors' own occupations, six or 40 percent made their careers in education with four being solely tutors, one a professor, and one a Harvard president. The ministry claimed five or one third of the tutors (a slightly larger percentage than the college average of 25 percent), and one

fifth (three) became doctors or lawyers. Only one became a farmer. These data confirm Smith's contention that education was developing as a career. It is also indicative of the increasing attractiveness of the tutorship itself. By 1771 it had become a position which a selected group of "middle-aged" young men were willing to take up several years after their baccalaureates and pursue as a career for another nine or more years.

The Yale tutorship, however, appears to have been a rather different experience. In the first place there were 36 or twice as many tutors during the same period, even though Yale enrollments were generally smaller than Harvard's. The average tenure was three years, and the waiting period between the BA degree and the tutorship was only four years. Although Yale tutors entered college at the same age as their Harvard counterparts, they were younger when they took a tutorship, and they served a much shorter time. The primary interim occupations of the tutors was either keeping school (25 percent), usually the one in New Haven, or the Berkeley or Dean fellowships (31 percent). Only two of the 36 tutors held any other college office prior to their tutorship. Thus, a typical career line of the Yale tutor lay through winning a scholarship, while at Harvard it tended to be through other college offices.

Background information is available for 28 of the tutors. As Table 2 indicates, of this number, 46 percent of the Yale tutors had fathers who were ministers, with 21 percent in trade and 25 percent in the military or other public service. Occupational and other information was available for 32 of the 36 tutors. Of these, twenty or 63 percent went into the ministry with eleven (or 55 percent) following in their own father's footsteps. Seven tutors or 19 percent became lawyers while three or nine percent had careers in education. Clearly the tutorship at Harvard and Yale each conforms to one of the stated hypotheses about the colonial tutorship. But based on these two colleges alone it is not

possible to tell which depiction in the literature is the more accurate.

When we turn to the second question: who were the students most often in conflict with the tutors, the scholarly debate has to do specifically with the social class origins of such students. One contention which has been supported by Flacks[12] and Kenniston[13] on the contemporary scene and by Morison,[14] Wertenbaker[15] and Shipton[16] for the eighteenth century contends that student troublemakers tend to come from wealthy, permissive, upperclass families. This is the theory that undergirds various studies of student protesters of the 1960's and of the student disrupters of campuses in the 1760's through 1830's. In my own previous research I have described the characteristics of Harvard students who were involved in various acts against the college, its governors and property during the period 1636 to 1724, and for the eighteenth century generally.[17] This research has tended to confirm the findings of these other scholars regarding the upperclass backgrounds of student offenders. Recently, however, Allmendinger's research on indigent students in several New England colleges during the antebellum period suggests another hypothesis.[18] Allmendinger maintains that the influx of a significant group of older middle- and working-class youth who possessed maturity and economic autonomy resulted in their leading the attack upon the college's restrictive paternalism and antiquated educational and governance systems.

In order to examine these alternative hypotheses I have collected data on those students punished at Yale from 1745-1771. The broad outlines of student activism and indiscipline during the Clap years is well-known, but less well studied in depth. The story is a familiar, even classic, one of a domineering, religiously orthodox president who waged a successful campaign for his views in the forum of public opinion only to be overthrown by determining student opposition on his own campus. Clap's personality and policies at Yale were the

extreme opposite of Holyoke's at Harvard. In dealing with students Clap was inquisitorial, autocratic, religiously self-righteous and intolerant. His views on the purpose of Yale as a seminary to train a religious elite were well and widely known in his own day and were highly controversial in some quarters.

The data gathered from the faculty records and Dexter biographies, indicate some of the parameters of the struggle between Clap and his hand-picked tutors and the Yale students.[19] The sample I have used are the multiple offenders, those students whose names appear in the faculty records as having committed more than one punishable offense. The numbers of single entries runs to approximately 200 names of lawbreakers, but this includes notations for many minor offenses and fines. The number of recorded multiple offenders, whose crimes were usually more serious as well as more numerous, is fifty-five. This number excludes those 13 students who were reported as expelled. These students could not be included because Dexter's biographies, unlike Shipton's, do not include permanent expellees. In addition, one has the distinct impression that under Clap expulsion was truly a permanent state. This is in distinct contrast to Harvard's unwritten policy of treating an expulsion like an extended suspension or rustication. Thus, the Yale multiple offenders are those students who committed two or more punishable offenses but who nevertheless succeeded in graduating, usually with their class.

The principal comparisons will be with the population of Yale graduates as summarized by Bailey.[20] The most interesting comparisons concern residency, father's and own occupations. With regard to residency, Bailey reported that 78 percent of the total population of graduates came from Connecticut with the remainder coming from Massachusetts, New York and Long Island, Rhode Island and a miscellany of other places. The multiple offenders differ somewhat in that only 64 percent are Connecticut residents and 36 percent are from out of the colony.

With respect to father's occupation, the data is not good for either the general population or the offenders. Bailey can account for only 40 percent of the fathers' occupations. Data on the multiple offenders can account for 60 percent of their father's occupations.[21] Table 3 shows a comparative representation of father's occupations for the graduates and the multiple offenders. As the data indicate, the student offenders are different from their classmates in some important ways. First, almost twice the percentage of graduates' fathers were ministers compared to the offenders. This is further differentiated by the fact that of the six offenders' fathers who were ministers the majority were not Congregationalists, three were Anglican and one was a Baptist. The other important difference by father's occupation occurs in the category of trade. Nearly five times the percentage of offenders' fathers were engaged in trade compared with the general Yale population. Moreover, of this group of 13, ten were not merchants but sea captains. And indeed sea captain's sons form the single largest group of student offenders during the period.

An explanation of these discrepancies can be approached from two points of view. The first argues that Clap as a religious demagogue was notoriously intolerant and highly discriminatory in his treatment of students who did not profess his version of the Congregationalist faith. His treatment of the Cleaveland brothers deserves special note, but also his reluctant agreement to allow the Anglican students to have a separate worship. With regard to the sea captains' sons, it is likely that they were not perceived to be ministerial material and they probably did not comport themselves in the desired manner, thus the heavy hand of discipline fell upon them.

The other point of view is that there were apparently distinct groups of students who did not fit the primary mission of the college. Either they professed a different faith or they came from different backgrounds, particularly

backgrounds which did not coincide with the beliefs and policies of the college governors. This difference led such students to oppose and attempt to thwart the government of the college. Their efforts were countered with the disciplinary measures available to the president and tutors in the college laws.

When the occupations of these student offenders are compared with the general Yale population, as indicated in Table 4, the result is fairly comparable. But the category of the ministry deserves note. Bailey calculated that for the entire century approximately 36 percent of the graduates became ministers. (See my own recalculation of his figures in the table for a readjustment.) Calculations of the known occupations of the student offenders indicate that the percentage who entered the ministry was a comparable 33 percent. However, of the 13 student offenders who became ministers, five were known to have failed in their calling because of intemperance, debt or bad character. Clap and his tutors would doubtless have felt some vindication of their treatment of these students in light of their apparent ability to identify "bad seeds."

These evidences of discriminant treatment of identifiable subgroups of students favors the possibility that family background was a better predictor of a student's disciplinary history than was his career "aspirations". This does not discount the fact that students could attend Yale and go on to succeed at callings quite different from those that might be expected based on their family backgrounds. Thus sea captains' sons could and did succeed in becoming respected ministers, and some respected ministers' sons did ultimately lead ignominious lives. But my data still tend to support the notion that family background had an important effect upon the kind of experience a boy had while a student.

Finally, let us turn to the last subquestion: What do these findings contribute to our understanding of the conflictful side of the student-tutor

relationship? The primary demographic differences between Yale tutors and students has to do with occupations. (See Tables 2 and 3 above.) With respect to father's occupation, the interesting differences are in the categories of minister and trade. While 46 percent of tutor's fathers were ministers, only 18 percent of the student offenders had ministers for fathers. And both of these must be compared with 35 percent for the entire Yale population. Similarly, 38 percent of the students' fathers were traders, especially sea captains, as contrasted with 21 percent for the tutors and 8 percent for the entire population. It would seem that differences in background between tutors and offenders were dramatic and yet in predictable directions. Yale under Clap was primarily a Congregational seminary. Thus, it is understandable that Connecticut's Congregational ministers and their congregations especially would desire to send their sons there, the Great Awakening and its controversies to the contrary notwithstanding. The "best" of those sons, that is, those who fitted Clap's own preferences, would likely be chosen as tutors, the president's lieutenants. Moreover, their relative youth and rapid turnover in the tutorship would probably insure a closer following of the Clap policies. Contrast this with the maturity and length of service of the Harvard tutors who established themselves as a resident governing body, by which they managed many college matters without Holyoke's immediate supervision.

It is also reasonable to assume that those students who were most likely to provoke and be provoked by the laws and customs of Clap's Yale would be those students who were in background and disposition most distinctly different from the mainstream. Few fit this better than the sea captains' sons or the sons of a different faith. In the first instance, the conflict in values is evident in the nature of the crimes for which they were punished. For the most part the crimes were either social or anti-authoritarian. These included, in order of

frequency, card playing, tavern going, play-acting and riots, first; second, destruction of college property, while third in frequency but probably first in seriousness were acts of defiance, disobedience or disrespect to college authorities. But rather than conclude this section with more statistics let me flesh out this picture with some biographical detail about some of the students and tutors for whom the conflicts were real and vital.

The Yale student who accumulated the most recorded offenses was J. Denison (Y.C. 1756) whose name appears more than nine times in the faculty records. His father was a wealthy and prominent sea captain and West Indes trader. Denison entered Yale at 16 and during his freshman year he was punished four times (usually by fines) for card playing, bell ringing, brandishing a pistol, and swearing and scuffling. His sophomore year he participated in three riots for which he was variously fined. His junior year he had several offenses for which he was deprived of the privilege of fagging underclassmen. And during his senior year he was convicted of stealing £10 from a fellow student and running away. He was expelled for this last activity but was later degraded and restored. Upon graduation he joined his father in business and became a captain in his own right.[22]

The tie for second place for most notorious offender goes to Samuel Ely (Y.C. 1764) whose father's occupation is unknown and Winthrop Saltonstall (Y.C. 1756) the second son of a General Gurdon Saltonstall (Y.C. 1726). Saltonstall appears to have confined himself primarily to a seige of bell-ringing, but in his sophomore year he did run out on one punishment session which earned him a suspension for contempt.[23]

Ely stands out as a truly infamous character for whom Yale was a mere warmup. His crimes ranged from bell ringing in his freshman ye[illegible]o theft, cheating and card playing in his junior year. When senior year came his

repeated offenses in combination with deficient scholarship got him rusticated for a full year. President Dwight who was a tutor at the time remembered him as "brazen-faced in his wickedness." Upon graduation he became a minister but was soon dismissed for bad character. He next became something of a religious demagogue and was ultimately arrested and banished.[24] As these cases indicate, students could be as provoking as provoked. In extreme cases the college appears to have been long-suffering, especially if the family were prominent but even in the case of ne'er-do-wells like Ely.

Although it lacked a target of student rancor of the stature of Clap, Harvard also had its share of student-tutor conflicts. The excellent detail of the Shipton biographies is most helpful in uncovering the circumstances of many of these incidents. One of the best examples occurred in 1769 when the students launched a wholesale attack upon all the tutors. In typical Harvard style the battle was waged on both literary and physical fronts. The three tutors involved were Stephen Scales (H.C. 1763), Andrew Eliot, (H.C. 1762) and Joseph Willard (H.C. 1765).[25] All three were minister's sons, but it was Willard, an eventual Harvard president, who conformed most uniformly to the older student pattern Allmendinger describes. Because of his stepfather's economic straits Willard worked as a schoolmaster before entering college. Consequently, he was 30 years old when he became a tutor while Scales and Eliot were 26 and 23 years old respectively. All three had reputations as able even brilliant scholars but they were also known as haughty and supercilious. Needless to say it was the latter qualities which provoked the students to burn them in effigy one riotous evening. When the students were caught and punished they revenged themselves by publishing a "number of scurrilous libels" in the form of a poem entitled, "A True Description of a Number of Tyrannical Pedagogues." The poem concludes with this advice to future students:

"But if their [tutors'] mulcts grow wider every Hour,
Wider their struts and arbitrare their Power,
I would advise you Sons of Harvard then
To let them know that you are sons of men."[26]

Perhaps because of the smaller number of tutors and their longer service there is more known about them as individuals than the Yale group. It seems safe to say that few if any tutors escaped some harassment from students, but one suspects that in general it was in direct proportion to the kind and degree of harassment they dealt students. The motivations for becoming a tutor and, indeed, for remaining for any extended time are difficult to discern. We do know that in general academic merit played a part. A large proportion of both Harvard and Yale tutors were recipients of scholarships and fellowships like the Hopkins and Berkeley which recognized scholarship and promise. Most of the Harvard tutors, as with the Yale group, prepared for the ministry, but those who made tutoring a career are united in a dissatisfaction with the ministry. Either they developed distaste for it or the parishoners who tried them out expressed a distaste for them. Few had as embarrassing an experience as one tutor had but it is indicative of the desire to persist at tutoring. One Sabbath, Harvard tutor, Belcher Hancock, is reported to have discovered upon arrival to preach that a good part of the congregation had gone to another church "not being able to bear Mr. Hancock's Doctrines."[27]

It is also noticeable that several tutors at both colleges experienced various frailties, especially poor health. Yale in particular appears to have been hard on tutors; six died before the age of 30. Harvard for its part had to deal with two tutors who became notorious drunks. On the other side, tutors were not likely to miss desirable opportunities. It is surely no accident that Timothy Pitkin (Y.C. 1747) married one of Clap's daughters and William Kneeland

(H.C. 1751) married one of President Holyoke's. In both cases the presidents lost a tutor but gained a son-in-law.

These latter facts serve to point out the humanness of the educational enterprise in which students, tutors and presidents found themselves. But it does not deny the existence of pattern and system. First, family background counted for much more in this time than other "credentials". Thus, it is predictable that a tutor's career and a student's college experience might be predicated heavily upon assessments of their background. Second, there is no question that each college held and attempted to impart a distinct sense of mission to all members of its community. As chief officers in defense and promulgation of that mission, the tutors were carefully selected and directed in their efforts. Students who did not fit the college ideals were not chosen as tutors, neither were they afforded much room to challenge, disobey or thwart the college efforts before its legal and social sanctions were invoked. And tutors were the primary agents in the administration of those sanctions.

While not yet a highly significant institution for status or career attainment, the college was nevertheless perceived as necessary by some, useful by others. Few were the men for whom the college itself became the focus of their life's work, but during the period under study Harvard was distinctive for the greater stability and maturity of its tutor corps while Yale had youth and zeal on its side. Despite clear differences in presidential leadership and tutorial characteristics there were serious struggles and discontents on the part of students at both institutions. The presence of conflict at both colleges speaks to the universality and significance of the confrontation. As my research has demonstrated, at both institutions the confrontation had as much if not more to do with "the manner," in Adams terms, by which the education was imparted by the tutors and "the manner" in which it was imbibed by the students. And the

disputes over manner appear to be strongly if not causally linked to basic differences of social status between students and their tutors. These differences reinforced and were reinforced by college custom and presidential direction.

Table 1. Comparison of Characteristics of Harvard and Yale Tutors, 1745-1771

	Harvard N=15	Yale N=36
Average years as a tutor	9 years	3 years
Average age at start of tutorship	27 years	24 years
Average number of years between BA and tutorship	7 years	4 years
Activities prior to tutorship*		
a. kept school	9 (60%)	9 (25%)
b. fellowship	4 (27%)	11 (31%)
c. college officer	7 (47%)	2 (6%)

*Percentages total more than 100 because some tutors engaged in more than one activity.

Table 2. Occupations of Harvard and Yale Tutors and Their Fathers

	Father's Occupation		Tutor's Occupations	
	Harvard	Yale	Harvard	Yale
1. Ministry	4 (29%)	13 (46%)	5 (33%)	20 (63%)
2. Farming	4 (29%)	2 (7%)	1 (7%)	1 (3%)
3. Trade	4 (29%)	6 (21%)	-	1 (3%)
4. Public Service	1 (7%)	7 (25%)	-	-
5. Education	1 (7%)	-	6 (40%)	3 (9%)
6. Law	-	-	2 (13%)	7 (22%)
7. Medicine	-	-	1 (7%)	-
Total	14 (100%)	28 (99%)	15 (100%)	35 (100%)

Table 3. Father's Occupations of Yale Graduates and Multiple Offenders

	Graduates*	Multiple Offenders
Ministry	287 (35%)	6 (18%)
Farming	229 (28%)	5 (15%)
Trade	69 (8%)	13 (38%)
Public Service	36 (4%)	5 (15%)
Education	2 (1%)	-
Law	93 (11%)	-
Medicine	67 (8%)	2 (6%)
Manufacture	7 (1%)	2 (6%)
Miscellaneous	33 (4%)	1 (3%)
Total	823 (100%)	34 (100%)

*Recalculated from Bailey's statistics by eliminating the unknowns from the base. Yale Review, Feb., 1908, p. 406.

Table 4. Occupations of Yale Graduates and Multiple Offenders

	Graduates*	Multiple Offenders
Ministry	729 (41%)	13 (33%)
Farming	115 (6%)	2 (5%)
Trade	230 (13%)	7 (18%)
Public Service	40 (2%)	3 (8%)
Education	67 (4%)	-
Law	346 (19%)	7 (18%)
Medicine	221 (12%)	7 (18%)
Manufacture	14 (1%)	-
Miscellaneous	28 (2%)	-
Total	1790 (100%)	39 (100%)

*Based on a recalculation of Bailey's statistics by elmininating the unknowns (N=225) from the base, Yale Review, Feb. 1908, p. 406.

Notes

1. January, 1872 as reprinted in Henry Adams, Historical Essays, New York: Charles Scribners and Sons, 1891, pp. 80-121.

2. Ibid., 107.

3. Ibid., 116.

4. Ibid., 108.

5. The Intellectual Life of Colonial New England, Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell Paperbacks, 1956.

6. "The Teacher in Puritan Culture," Harvard Education Review XXXVI (1966), 402.

7. David Allmendinger, "The Dangers of Ante-Bellum Student Life," Journal of Social History, 7, 1 (Fall, 1973), 75.

8. Cf. P.M.G. Harris, "The Social Origins of American Leaders: The Demographic Foundations," Perspectives in American History VIII (1969), 159-346.

9. Richard Hofstadter, Academic Freedom in the Age of The College. (N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1955), 24.

10. Clifford K. Shipton, Sibley's Harvard Graduates, IX, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936), 68.

11. Smith, op. cit.

12. Richard Flacks, Youth and Social Change (Chicago: Markham, 1971).

13. Kenneth Kenniston, Radicals and Militants: Annotated Bibliography on Empirical Research on Campus Unrest,(Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1973).

14. Morison, op. cit.

15. Thomas J. Wertenbaker, Princeton, 1746-1896,(Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946).

16. Shipton, op. cit. et passim.

17. See my "Old Saints and Young Sinners: A Study of Student Discipline at Harvard College 1636-1724." (Unpublished dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1972) and "Freedom anddConstraint in Eighteenth Century Harvard, The Journal of Higher Education (forthcoming).

18. Paupers and Scholars, N.Y.: St. Martin's Press, 1975.

19. Franklin B. Dexter, Yale Biographies and Annals, New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1885.

20. William Bailey, "A Statistical Study of the Yale Graduates, 1701-92," Yale Review (1908), 400-426.

21. I concur with Bailey's assertion that farming is probably the least accurate estimate. In his survey 28 percent of the fathers were farmers; of the multiple offenders, 16 percent.

22. Dexter, II, 415.

23. Dexter, III, 68.

24. Dexter, II, 429.

25. Shipton, XV, 492-3, 224 and XVI, 253-4.

26. Ms. Harvard University Archives, 1769.

27. Shipton, VIII, 43-44.